

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20 and 23-28 were pending. The applicants amend claims 1, 8, and 24 and cancel claims 25-26. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the applicants' specification at paragraph [0047] and [0049] of US 2007/0253667 A1. The applicants present the pending claims for examination in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20, 23, 24, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0175621 ("Song"), in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0222433 ("Mazzochette"), further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0104460 ("Stark").

Claim 1 recites "an adhesion promoting part comprising a ceramic, the adhesion promoting part provided with a recess that is part of the cavity of said housing body[.]" Song, Mazzochette, and Stark, alone or in combination, do not disclose or make obvious this feature.

The office action acknowledges that neither Song nor Mazzochette discloses an adhesion promoting part provided with a recess that is part of the cavity of said housing body.¹ Furthermore, the applicants have been unable to find any indication that Mazzochette discloses an adhesion promoting part at all, much less an adhesion promoting part that (1) comprising ceramic or (2) provided with a recess that is part of the cavity of said housing body. Rather, in the cited text, Mazzochette recites

[0028] A transparent cover 19 can be provided by bonding a transparent clear cover or lens over the cavity 18 (as by epoxy). The seal can be made hermetic by addition of a bonding pad and brazed seal ring (not shown).

The office action does not indicate what feature of Mazzochette is alleged to correspond to the adhesion promoting part recited by the applicants' claims.

Stark does not remedy this deficiency. The applicants do not concede that Stark's sheet seal-ring area 318 and metallized layers 610 correspond to the adhesion promoting part recited

¹ Office action dated October 14, 2011, page 3.

by the applicants' claims. However, even if they did, Stark's sheet seal-ring area 318 and metallized layers 610 do not disclose or make obvious an adhesion promoting part that comprises a ceramic. Rather, Stark, in the cited figure and associated text, disclose elements which are designed to transmit radiation, these elements being connected to other elements. Figures 3 and 8 of Stark show the frame 302 of the cover assembly 300 which is connected to the transparent sheet 304 having a window portion 312.² Regardless of whether the frame 302 is formed of a metallic or non-metallic material, the surface of the frame seal-ring area 310 is metallic to facilitate the hermetic sealing of the sheet 304 to the frame 302.³ However, the sheet 304 has to be made of a transparent material.⁴ The materials recited for the sheet do not include ceramic. The sheet seal-ring area 318 is part of the sheet 304 and, thus, transparent. Consequently, area 318 does not comprise a ceramic and, therefore, is different from the claimed adhesion promoting part. Of course, metallized layers 610 do not disclose or hint at a ceramic.

For at least these reasons, Song, Mazzochette, and Stark, alone or in combination, do not disclose or make obvious all of the features of claim 1. According, the applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the associated dependent claims as being unpatentable over Song, Mazzochette, and Stark.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song, in view of Mazzochette, further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0093116 ("Palmteer"). Claims 25 and 26 have been canceled

In Conclusion

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicants have (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicants concede other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good

² See, e.g., Stark, paragraphs [0089] and [0090].

³ See, e.g., Stark, paragraph [0089].

⁴ See, e.g., Stark, paragraph [0089].

Applicant : Herbert Brunner et al.
Serial No. : 10/593,794
Filed : March 13, 2007
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 12406-0216US1 / P2004,0241 US N

reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicants concede any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 12406-0216US1.

Respectfully submitted,



Sean M. Dean, Ph.D., J.D.
Reg. No. 46,656

Date: February 14, 2012

Customer Number 26161
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945